UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,369	11/26/2003	Michael E. Sproul	2630.001	1491
21917 7590 04/15/2009 MCHALE & SLAVIN, P.A. 2855 PGA BLVD			EXAMINER	
			SIGLER, JAY R	
PALM BEACH GARDENS, FL 33410		)	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3775	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2009	PAPER

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/724,369	SPROUL, MICHAEL E.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JAY R. SIGLER	3775			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 De	ecember 2008				
,— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.				
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8,10,12 and 14-17</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-6 and 14-17</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7,8,10 and 12</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)	A) 🔲 Indominou Consumen	(PTO 442)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3775

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 14-15, the language "said second state having **size of** at least one of said size and said shape" (emphasis added) has grammatical errors. The language is suggested to be "said second state having at least one of said size and said shape". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0026195 to Layne et al. (hereinafter "Layne") in view of "Artificial Muscles" to Ashley (cited in IDS filed 26 November 2003; hereinafter "Ashley").

Layne discloses an orthopedic system that includes an expansion mechanism (50) including a first state sized and shaped for insertion through a cannula 200 and a second state sized and shaped to alter bone (see Fig. 24 and 25); wherein after a cavity is created the expansion mechanism is contracted (see ¶ 84). Layne does not disclose

Art Unit: 3775

the expansion member with the transducer structure or an electroactive polymer.

Ashley discloses a transducer that is an electroactive polymer sandwiched between electrodes (see section "How electricity makes a plastic expand); source of electrical energy; and suggests the transducer be used in medical products (see pg. 54, 1st ¶). The transducer of Ashley is used as an expansion mechanism. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the device of Ashley in the orthopedic system of Biscup, because the substitution of one known expansion system for another would have yielded predictable results, namely to create a cavity in vertebrae. Additionally, the expansion mechanism of Ashley does include two states and would go from one state to the other when electrical energy is applied and disconnected (see page 56, 5<sup>th</sup> full paragraph; shown by reference to the electrodes growing and shrinking).

Layne further discloses the device to alter cancellous bone or cortical bone (see ¶ 84).

### Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the Biscup reference have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the Ashley reference have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Ashley device would assume its original configuration in the absence of the electrical connection as shown above.

Art Unit: 3775

#### Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAY R. SIGLER whose telephone number is (571)270-3647. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8 AM to 4 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. Barrett can be reached on (571) 272-4746. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3775

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. R. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3775 /Thomas C. Barrett/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3775